Surveillance - in the

JFK assassinations records requests (inc. C.A. 78-0322) Harold Weisberg 3/3/80
PA requests, FBIHQ and all field offices
Deliberately incomplete searches
Refusal to consult see references
Failure to act on appeals

As I clear up the accumulation of records I copied for appeals and subject filing I came across several that pertain to me. Ms. Barrett has compared them with the responses I received from field offices and finds that the records included in the FBIHQ general releases include what was not included in responses to my PA requests. I find references to other records that have not been provided.

The first of my appeals was in late 1975 or early 1976. There has been no response.

The subject matter is a threat against Jim Garrison that was fed to me from San Francisco when I was in New Orleans. As I'm sure I've informed you in other appeals to which you have not responded, the person who obtained the information, who is not the one who phoned me, in an entirely separate matter is in FBI and Secret Service files of threats against the President. (Los Angeles.) The person who phoned me is a respected San Francisco reporter. Earlier, some of his broadcasts were classified "SECRET" by the FBI, the tapes of his broadcasts, actually.

When he phoned me at such an unholy hour I knew something had to be up so before accepting the call I got my tape recorder and a suction phone pickup I carried in those days when I was receiving threats.

After the end of the conversation I awakened (then sergeant) Louis Ivon, a regular New Orleans policeman assiged to Garrison as his chief investigator. He came to my motel room, we listened to the tape, we then had breakfast and discussed it and then went to his office. He consulted the assistant DAs, not in my presence, and I presume they had other conferences of which I did and do not know.

One of my recommendations was that the FBI be notified. After the conferences this was agreed to and I did that. I don't suppose that it ever occurred to the FBI paranoids that with the feuding between the FBI and Garrison this could have been in the FBI's benefit.

NO/PA

Like most people I also believed that the FBI, supposedly, kept up with the mafia anywhere in the country. This threat was attributed to the mafia in San Francisco.

Contrary to what the general release records indicate, I had but a single conversation with the FBI about this, the time I phoned. I then spoke to an agent who, to the best of my recollection, was named Hood, not the one who prepared the report.

He did call back, but he did not speak to me. He merely left a ~~recd~~ brief message to the effect that other local police were being informed.

The HQ records, all 62-109060, are Serials 5903, 5905, 5909, 5910 and 5916.

5909 is an Albuquerque teletype to HQ and NO of 12/14/67. That day it and other stations received the N.O. teletype (5916) of some hours after my call. Yet Albuquerque claimed in response to my request that it had no records pertaining to me. Likewise, although these are marked for indexing at FBIHQ, no copies were provided from FBIHQ. The mark appears on the records and the spelling of my name is corrected.

In stating what did not happen ("WEISSBERG HAS BEEN TOLD THAT . . .SGT. SULLIVAN ACTING COMMANDER INTELLIGENCE DIVISION, NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT HAS BEEN NOTIFIED ...") the FBI discloses (in 5916) the need for other records, not provided, to exist. I am particularly interested in the FBI's speaking to Sullivan because that is the name of a sergeant who recruited Oswald into the Civil Air Patrol and testified untruthfully about David Ferrie to the Warren Commission. Because I didnot speak to the FBI other than in the morning, when I phoned the report in, there was no possibility of its having spoken to me about what it did later, that afternoon.

There can be other explanations of the N.O. instructions to other offices not to do as SF asked or anything further without specific FBIHQ instructions. Quite properly SF wanted leads and my source, so a check with the motel about an incoming call in the wee hours was pretty obvious. The motel at which I stayed was thoroughly covered by the FBI and the Department later released the transcripts of the results of phone tapping there in another Garrison case. It also disclosed some of this to me in C.A. 75-1996, where the record provided has no identifiers but they were obvious to me.

5905 refers to a phone conversation about this (FBIHQ) at 10:10 a.m., or an hour later New Orleans time, and "an earlier request made to Sad Highmayer for clarifying information regarding New Orleans teletype today in this matter." (It refers to Lee Rudrow, not Rood.) This presents some problems when compared with the only New Orleans teletype included, 5916. It states that it was sent at 3:55 p.m., or an hour later in Washington, and that I didn't phone until 11:46 a.m. It therefor is obvious that there was an earlier teletype and that N.O. knew of this matter other than from my call to it. The 10:10 a.m. phone call from New Orleans, in response to the HQ request for clarification, was not only more than an hour and a half before I phoned - it was in response to an inquiry from FBIHQ in response to this earlier teletype.

So how did anybody know before I called? Or do you see what I mean about coverage at my hotel?

(Parenthetically, during this period my wife was getting phone calls from strangers who knew I was away, had no known means of knowing this, and suggesting strongly that she should be afraid that something would happen to me. In New Orleans my motel room was searched at least once and my addressbook was missing.)

We all know how fast the FBI is, particularly when it has no interest and there are instructions to stay away from the Garrison matter (at least in terms of letting interest be known.) How fast is indicated by 5909, timed at 6:30 p.m., or 5:30 in N.O. By then Albuquerque had received the N.O. teletype and had made phone calls (how many not indicated) to N.O. It also conducted interviews away from the office. It had checked a motel and learned the name under which a Garrison [illegible] was staying, an alias. (Not not the alias under which he was ticketed, as I know from having gone to the airport with him the night before at his request.) I think you'll be impressed with all that the ad FO did, including drafting the teletype., ostensibly in much less than an hour and a half. Jules Verne could have had them circumnavigating the earth before they started.

As usual, Hoover was omniscient, aka paranoid, as 5915 reflects. He ordained of

all of this, beginning with my being awakened about 4 a.m. after about 2 hours of sleep and my awakening Ivon, who had a final exam that day (he'd return to college for a criminology degree), that "It is another diversionary tactic by Garrison." (Why these records were also sent to the Inspection Division I can't guess but that is indicated in 5916, along with Domestic Intelligence.)

None of these records were provided by AO, HO or Dallas and, because I've checked, if any were sent to those in whose turf I live, not by those FOs, either.

Dallas did provide a later (1/8/68) LHM but it makes no reference to the phone call unless it is in what is excised.

New Orleans also provided an interesting record, the copy of the teletype as it was prepared for transmission. (NO 89-69-3616.) Except for corrections and changes it is line for line identical with the wired copy, 5916. As you know, there can be no time on the message before it is sent, so no time appears on this and no machine copy was provided by N.O.

Among the matters of interest is that the original draft stated that "WEISBERG IS BEING TOLD...." and "WILL BE NOTIFIED..." As transmitted this reads "WEISBERG HAS BEEN TOLD" and "HAS BEEN NOTIFIED." This is what I say above did not happen. And, of course, there is the change of tense, meaning of time. (This, however, cannot be the teletype prior to 10:10 a.m. referred to above because it also places the time of my call to the field office at 11:56 a.m.)

On the first page of 89-69-3616 some notations have been added. They are unclear in this copy and I would like to be able to read them. The first appears to be "WA 3:55 with a "P" under the minutes. Then there is "AQ" with a time beginning with a 4. (This gave it even less time that I state above if it is the time of transmission.) What appears to be SF has 4:19 after it and SF a later time beginning with a 4.

Usually FBIHQ is given as Bureau, not Washington. However, the Washington field office is usually given as WFO, which makes me wonder if WA represents another office.

The initials are GJH. Unclear notations on the last page include, "Weisberg talked to Mr SA Hood." and [illegible]

In SO, 5910 is 5907. A notation added has the name of "Wall" in it. He was a supervisor on the JFK case. The names of the other SAs are not included.

New Orleans did not provide copies of the other records although on this one I am marked for a see reference. One presumes it to be true of the others.

HQ did better it provided none at all, even though as stated above I am marked with the see reference mark, my name is corrected and underscored.

The LHM referred to above is attached to the SO airtel of 1/9/63 that is part of the same matter, 62-109060-6042. In Dallas this is 89-43-7818, without the airtel as provided under my PA request. The airtel gives the name that is obliterated but I tell you Rye without any first name, which is certainly odd for a first mention. (It is Richard.)

(I have referred to this in earlier appeals in connection with Tom Sanders, KK of the San Francisco area.)

Dallas stapled a piece of paper over the entire text of the first page of the LHM. FBIHQ obliterated all but the last four lines of text. In these lines it obliterated Rye's name and another that is disclosed by the not withheld identifiers.

Dallas obliterated more than the second half of the second page in the same way. In what remains this is clearly identified as the subject of my phone call of 12/14/77

Harv Morgan is the reporter who phoned me, by the way, but I had nothing to do with Rye's trip to N.O., as this indicates. Or with his dispute with Sanders, whose name, with typical FBI consistency, is not withheld. (Reference to HQ copy in general releases.)

(Also not provided from DJ records and copy to Weisl is indicated.) I did file a separate request of all other DJ components, as you know.)

Although the airtel originated in New Orleans and I am the cause of all of this and am named in the LHM, New Orleans did not provide this under my PA request. And although I am marked for indexing in the FBIHQ copy, it also did not provide a copy in response to my PA request. Meanwhile, all my appeals remain ignored. (No appeal to AG only.)

If you can let me know how the wizards of the FBI know in advance what I would

report, that it would require clarification and had this alleged clarification before I made any report, I'd sure like to know. It is not that I want to steal the FBI's stuff. Rather is it that this is not the only incomprehensible I've come across, nor is it the only time I'm indeed only not to show up on an alleged search.